April 1997 Preprint MPI-PTh/97-28

Comment on "Cherenkov Radiation by Neutrinos in a Supernova Core"

Georg G. Raffelt
Max-Planck-Institut für Physik, Föhringer Ring 6, 80805 München, Germany
(16 April 1997)

Mohanty and Samal have shown that the magnetic-moment interaction with nucleons contributes significantly to the photon dispersion relation in a supernova core, and with an opposite sign relative to the usual plasma effect. Because of a numerical error they overestimated the magnetic-moment term by two orders of magnitude, but it is still of the same order as the plasma effect. It appears that the Cherenkov processes $\gamma\nu \to \nu$ and $\nu \to \nu\gamma$ remain forbidden, but a final verdict depends on a more detailed investigation of the dynamical magnetic susceptibility of a hot nuclear medium.

arXiv:hep-ph/9704352v1 18 Apr 1997

Mohanty and Samal [1] found that in a supernova (SN) core the photon refractive index receives a contribution from the nucleon magnetic moments which is far more important and of opposite sign compared with the usual electronic plasma effect. This would cause the photon four momentum $K = (\omega, \mathbf{k})$ to be spacelike, allowing for the Cherenkov processes $\nu \to \nu\gamma$ or $\gamma\nu \to \nu$ with important consequences for the neutrino opacities or the emissivities of right-handed neutrinos. Unfortunately, a huge numerical error has crept into their analysis, invalidating their conclusions.

The contribution of the nucleon magnetic moments μ to the photon refractive index is $n^2_{\rm refr} = 1 + \chi$ in terms of the magnetic susceptibility χ. (Mohanty and Samal used unrationalized units where $4\pi\chi$ appears instead.) For small photon frequencies $\omega \to 0$ and in the long-wavelength limit $\mathbf{k} \to 0$ one may use the static Pauli susceptibility of the nucleons which in the degenerate limit is $\chi_0 = \mu^2 m_N\, p_F/\pi^2$ with m_N the nucleon mass and p_F its Fermi momentum. Expressing the magnetic moment in the usual form $\mu = \kappa\, e/2m_N$ gives us $n^2_{\rm refr} - 1 = \kappa^2\,(\alpha/\pi)\,(p_F/m_N)$ with $\alpha = e^2/4\pi \approx 1/137$ the fine-structure constant. For the conditions assumed in Ref. [1] the contributions from protons ($\kappa_p = 2.79$) and neutrons ($\kappa_n = -1.91$) add to $n^2_{\rm refr} - 1 = 0.81 \times 10^{-2}$, a factor 10^{-2} smaller than in Ref. [1]. Mohanty and Samal agree about this correction (private communication).

Intruigingly, this reduced result is still of the same order as the electronic contribution which is well approximated by $n^2_{\rm refr} - 1 = -\frac{3}{2}\,\omega_P^2/\omega^2$. In a SN core the electrons are degenerate so that the plasma frequency is $\omega_P^2 = (4\alpha/3\pi)p_F^2$ with p_F the electron Fermi momentum [2], leading to $n^2_{\rm refr} - 1 = -(2\alpha/\pi)\,(p_F/\omega)^2$. Because in a SN core the nucleons are only partially degenerate it is justified to compare this plasma term with the magnetic-moment contribution of nondegenerate nucleons. I find $\chi_0 = \mu^2 n_N/T$, leading to $n^2_{\rm refr} - 1 = \kappa^2\,(\alpha/3\pi)\,(p_F^3/Tm_N^2)$ where $n_N = p_F^3/3\pi^2$ was used for the nucleon density. Summing the contributions of protons and neutrons I find

$$\frac{(n^2_{\rm refr}-1)_P}{(n^2_{\rm refr}-1)_\mu} = -f(Y_e)\,\frac{Tm_N^2}{2\omega^2 p_F} \tag{1}$$
$$= -6.0\, f(Y_e)\,\frac{T}{30\,\text{MeV}}\left(\frac{100\,\text{MeV}}{\omega}\right)^2\left(\frac{10^{14}\,\text{g/cm}^3}{\rho}\right)^{1/3}.$$

Here, $\rho = m_N n_N$ is the mass density while the "baryon Fermi momentum" $p_F = (3\pi^2 n_N)^{1/3}$ is just a parameter to characterize the density. Finally, $f(Y_e) \equiv 12\,Y_e^{2/3}/[Y_e\kappa_p^2 + (1-Y_e)\kappa_n^2]$ is a slowly varying function which is about unity for a typical electron/baryon number fraction $Y_e = 0.3$. The proton fraction has been taken to equal Y_e because of charge neutrality so that there are $1 - Y_e$ neutrons per baryon.

Typical photons have energies around $\omega = 3T$ so that even $T = 60$ MeV and $\rho = 10^{15}$ g/cm^3 will not bring the ratio below unity. It appears that for all conditions occurring in a SN core the plasma term dominates, but only by a surprisingly narrow margin.

Because the plasma term decreases with ω^{-2} one may think that for the high-energy tail of the photon distribution the magnetic-moment term could dominate. One needs to remember, though, that this term is based on a thermodynamic derivation in the static limit and thus is valid only in the hydrodynamic limit, i.e. for frequencies well below the spin relaxation rate.

The spin relaxation rate in a SN core is not known, but probably does not exceed the temperature by much [3]. For frequencies exceeding the spin relaxation rate the spin susceptibility decreases, and should in fact become negative for large frequencies as can be shown by virtue of the Kramers-Kronig relations and the f-sum rule for the spin-density structure function. For large ω I find $n^2_{\rm refr} - 1 \propto -\omega^{-2}$, i.e. the same frequency dependence of the refractive index as that of the plasma effect. Note that for noninteracting fermions the magnetic-moment refractive index vanishes because the photon forward-scattering amplitude on a fermion with magnetic moment vanishes. Therefore, for frequencies far exceeding the spin relaxation rate the magnetic-moment induced

refractive index must indeed vanish. These matters will be discussed in more detail elsewhere.

As it stands, I believe that even though the plasma and nucleon magnetic moment contributions to the photon refractive index are tantalizingly close to each other, the plasma effect seems to win for all plausible conditions of a SN core. Therefore, the neutrino Cherenkov effect does not seem to occur in a SN core. However, because the plasma and magnetic-moment effects are so close to each other a more detailed investigation is called for.

I thank S. Mohanty for a collegial correspondence and P. Elmfors, A. Kopf, and G. Sigl for helpful remarks on an early version of the manuscript.

This work was supported, in part, by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft under grant No. SFB 375.

---

[1] S. Mohanty and M.K. Samal, Phys. Rev. Lett. **77**, 806 (1996).
[2] E. Braaten and D. Segel, Phys. Rev. D **48**, 1478 (1993).
[3] H.-T. Janka, W. Keil, G. Raffelt, and D. Seckel, Phys. Rev. Lett. **76**, 2621 (1996); G. Sigl, ibid. pg. 2625.